

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
EASTERN DIVISION

EMMANUEL S. TROTTER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 1:13-cv-01087-JDT-egb

DIANE RAMSEY,
Correctional Officer, et
al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Before this Court are motions [D.E. 29 and 33] filed by the *pro se* Plaintiff. The first motion [D.E. 29] seeks permission to serve fifteen additional interrogatories. In his recent letter to Defendants and the Court [D.E. 36], Plaintiff states a lack of communication between the parties and not being an attorney, concerning his efforts at serving interrogatories. Defendants' response [D.E. 32] opposes this request and provides two of Plaintiff's interrogatories claimed to be objectionable as irrelevant and meant to harass or demean one of the Defendants. The Court agrees with this characterization of the samples provided. Defendants also assert they have previously responded to interrogatories "with extensive discovery responses, including several documents related to the issues raised in this case." Further, Defendants assert that none of the proposed questions that are unanswered would produce

responses germane to this case. Nonetheless, the Court determines that Plaintiff should have six (6) additional interrogatories in total. Plaintiff is cautioned to use these additional interrogatories consistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and not in the fashion of the two samples provided by Defendants.

Plaintiff also has pending a motion to compel discovery [D.E. 33]. It appears to this Court that Plaintiff -- at the time he originally filed this motion August 28, 2014 -- was premature in it appears the Defendant had time remaining to respond since Plaintiff indicates he mailed his requests to Defendants "on, or around August 6, 2014." Based on what is before it at this time, the Court determines this motion to be MOOT.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 22nd day of October, 2014.

s/Edward G. Bryant
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE